

Fabian Tract No. 228.

AGRICULTURE AND THE LABOUR PARTY.

BY

G. T. GARRATT.

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY
THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

LONDON:

THE FABIAN SOCIETY, 11, DARTMOUTH STREET, WESTMINSTER,
LONDON, S.W.1.

PUBLISHED APRIL, 1929.



Agriculture and the Labour Party

By G. T. GARRATT.

The future of the farming industry presents one of the most difficult problems which the Labour Party has to face. Agriculture has, for many years, been the "last item on the agenda," the hopeless subject which no Cabinet dares to tackle. On the other hand many optimistic theories about farming in England are widely accepted in the Labour movement, while the land question has been so mangled by rival protagonists that it is difficult to get any countryman to take it seriously. It is easy to exaggerate the importance of land in English farming. The industry is chiefly engaged in turning uneatables into eatables, and reducing bulky food-stuffs, cereals and vegetables, into more concentrated forms. In these operations either land or animals can be used. A dairy farmer has frequently to decide whether he will spend £12 on four tons of basic slag for his pastures, or one ton of dairy cake for his cows. Both slag and cake are uneatable by-products to be converted into milk, but in one case the farmer uses both land and cows, in the other his stock only. It will be seen in a later section that the tendency in England is to use the land less, and to rely chiefly on stock, fed upon purchased food-stuffs. In farming parlance the land is used to provide bulky "roughage" for the stock, but the "concentrates" are imported.

It is best to look upon land partly as a machine, partly as a reserve of potential feeding stuffs. In the old and much worked lands of Europe and India the first aspect is of chief importance, and land is reckoned good or bad according to the ease with which it can be cultivated, and its retentiveness of the manures which are added to it. On virgin lands the second aspect is the most important, for these are so rich in humus that crops can be taken from them for two generations without any replenishing. The exploitation of such lands must be more profitable than the cultivation of old land, the soil deficiencies of which have to be supplied. One hears too frequently such remarks as "Why should our young men go to work in Canada when there is as good land at their own door?" The movement from old land to new has been going on for centuries. It can be seen in America to-day. The "Middle West" was typical virgin land which brought the first exploiters considerable prosperity. It is now almost worked out, and the old farming families are either migrating or being forced into "conservative" farming, the

European farming which is based on returning to the soil each year some of the constituents which have been removed by the last crop. Such farming is, in every country, very unremunerative compared with industry, and the latter, in America as in England, tends to drain from the former all the most active and enterprising men.

There is no real virgin land in England, and our land must usually be classed according to its efficiency as a medium of cultivation, or the ease with which it can be made to grow the valuable grasses. It may be too heavy to be handled easily, like our boulder clay, or too light to be retentive of manure, like the sandy soils which are to be found in certain Eastern counties, and which are so characteristic of North Europe. The amount of really good land, retentive but easy to work, is very limited. One recent development must be remembered. Modern economic changes are helping the light lands against the "strong" lands. Manures keep their price or become cheaper. Labour grows more expensive. Soils which are wasteful of manure are, therefore, relatively more profitable than those which require an excessive amount of labour. It is the heavy intractable clays which are going down to grass. The lighter lands are holding their own. In the West of England the difficulties of managing clay land are increased by the heavy rainfall and lack of winter frosts.

The position to-day is that five of our thirty million acres of agricultural land are classed as "rough grazing." Of the remainder some two-fifths are under arable cultivation. About a million acres are used for fruit, potatoes, and market garden crops. Two and a half million are under wheat and barley, the remaining arable land being used for crops which fit in with our "mixed" farming system, and are mostly used for feeding stock. Nearly all our land is in the hands of small scale producers, providing their own capital, and employing little labour. Arable farming has not proved sufficiently attractive to encourage the speculative capitalist, and only a small proportion of our mixed farming is undertaken by companies working on a large scale. The few exceptions are usually retail dairy companies, and the co-operative societies, but the latter have not found the business profitable, and are tending to give up their farms. The 300,000 men who call themselves farmers and graziers only employ some 670,000 men and boys, and even this latter figure is deceptive, for the proportion of lads under 21 is fifty per cent. higher than in industry generally. The regular workers, over 21 years old, only numbered 452,900 in 1927. The wage-earners in the farming industry are decreasing, the men who are their own masters seem to be increasing very slowly. Probably under five per cent. of our farmers now employ as many as ten men.

This exceedingly complex small-scale industry does not appeal to any except the most doctrinaire as a suitable subject for nationalisation. It would also appear that agriculture, unlike most other industries, does not lend itself to mass production except on prairie land or for beet growing. "Conservative" farming seems to be a small scale occupation. All serious political opinion is, therefore, in favour of modifying rather than replacing the existing organisation of English farming, based on the medium-sized mixed farm. It will be best to consider separately the three sides of the industry: (1) The land and the landlord's responsibilities; (2) The farm and the tenant's responsibilities; (3) The marketing of farm products.

1. Land and Buildings.

The typical English farm is owned by a private individual, and leased to a farmer. About three-quarters of the thirty million acres used for agriculture are held under this tenure. Of the remainder some six million acres are occupied and worked by their owners. Though the owner-occupier is rapidly becoming a common farming type—the number of such holdings and their area doubled between 1919 and 1924—the change is often one of name only. Most of the new tenants are old tenant-farmers who have been forced to buy their holdings on the breaking up of large estates. In nearly every case a heavy mortgage was raised in order to purchase, so that these farmers have really got "a bank for their landlord," and in many cases, owing to the fall in the price of agricultural land, the mortgage now exceeds the value of the farm.

More than a million acres of agricultural land are in the hands of public or semi-public bodies. The County Councils administer a little less than half a million under the Small Holdings Acts. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners own a quarter of a million acres, and the Universities an even larger area. Crown lands and the Duchy of Cornwall cover an area of nearly half a million acres, but much of this is woodland and waste.

The landlord's responsibilities include all permanent buildings, the farmhouse, homesteads, and cottages, drainage, roads, gates, etc. In most parts of England the landlord seldom advances money to his tenants for the purchase of "live and dead stock," nor is this ever considered to be his duty. Farming capital and landlord's capital are quite separate things. It is the latter which is being considered, and there is little doubt that in this respect English farms are badly equipped compared with those of most Western European countries, and that at present the position is getting worse rather than better. The best buildings are to be

found on a few large estates, where the owner is a wealthy man who looks upon his land as a hobby, and on farms which have been purchased by men who bought willingly, and have more capital than the size of the farm requires. Public bodies are usually better landlords than private. Their administration is more businesslike, and they are more consistent and generous in their estate management, partly because they are not muled for death duties. On the whole, however, the work is badly done, and in England an estate is considered to be well run if it is not actually deteriorating. Farm buildings are usually worse than farmhouses. Many of the former were planned when ideas of animal hygiene, labour saving, the conservation of farm-yard manure, and the production of clean milk were all totally different to those held to-day. In most cases the general "lay-out" is wrong, and many were planned when threshing was still done by hand. Farm drainage is also very much neglected. Pipe draining now costs about £10 an acre, which is the actual price of poor arable land in the Eastern counties. The work is therefore so uneconomic that little except mole draining has been done for many years, and the old pipe systems lie in the ground, blocked up and useless. Landlords are even more loath to build farm workers' houses than they are to indulge in drainage schemes. Even as "tied houses" these cottages are hopelessly uneconomic to build, and the whole system being open to obvious objections, the future of such houses is uncertain.

The position, then, would seem to be that the landlord's side of farming is everywhere neglected, except on a few estates where good work is done on a basis which is not really economic. The three great needs are for new farm buildings, better drainage, and more houses for wage-earners, and in some areas houses and homesteads for small-holders. For economic reasons private landlords, even when farming their own land, are unlikely to spend money on such enterprises, nor can they borrow money for the purpose. It is a form of investment which no solicitor would encourage, an important point, because vast areas are actually held under trusts. The substitution of public bodies for private landlords is, therefore, the only possible solution. The position was stated very clearly by Lord Irwin, the former Minister of Agriculture, in 1924 :—

" Any of us who are accustomed to live in the country, who watch the process going on, see to-day a deterioration in what I may call the capital equipment of the land and soil, whether in buildings or in drainage. . . . This means either that the soil is going to be starved, and is gradually going to lose some of its fecundity by the land becoming waterlogged, and so on;

or the nation is going to say: 'We cannot watch this process going on,' and the State will come in to fill the function of the old landlord by lending capital. When it does that you may depend upon it that it will claim some measure of control in the business that it finances, and so you may well find yourself within measurable distance of something like nationalisation by a side wind."

The present Conservative Government, with its enormous majority, and its control over the House of Lords, might easily have effected this transfer under conditions very favourable to the landlords. It has, however, contented itself with two palliatives, the Rural Housing Act, and the Agricultural Credits Act, which are about as effective in preventing deterioration as is the Lord Mayor's Fund to settle the problem of unemployment in the mining industry. It will be therefore left to the Labour Party to carry through the transference, and no one who has ever arranged for the Government acquisition of land is likely to underrate the complexity of the problem. It will have to be faced, and all that it is necessary to state here about the method to be employed is that compensation will be paid to the dispossessed landlords on the basis of the existing "Schedule A" assessment, and will be paid in the form of transferable land bonds bearing fixed interest. Normally the land which is farmed by its owner will not be affected, unless the owners themselves would prefer their farms to be taken over. This would happen frequently, as many owner occupiers are at their wits' end to find capital for carrying on their farming, and would gladly sell their farms if a sale "without possession" in the open market did not mean a very heavy loss.

The administration of the newly-acquired land would be in the hands of County Committees not unlike those already administering the considerable estates acquired under the Small Holdings Act, e.g., areas of over 26,000 acres in both Norfolk and Suffolk, and of over 18,000 in Cambridgeshire. The Committees would need to be strengthened, made more democratic, and brought into closer touch with the Ministry of Agriculture.

The transfer would have many direct and indirect advantages.

(1) The State would be assisted in the constructive mapping out of the whole country, in afforestation schemes, land settlement on suitable soils, and the preservation of natural beauty spots.

(2) Public bodies, with their power to raise loans, would be able to undertake the rebuilding of homesteads, and the provision of houses. Any drainage schemes would be immensely assisted by having all land under one control. At present those few



landlords and owner occupiers who want to drain their land are often discouraged by the difficulty of getting water away owing to the state of their neighbours' ditches.

(3) A unified authority would lead to the levelling up of the industry. Farmers would no longer have to study the idiosyncrasies of their landlords, and the farmer who habitually starves his land would not be able to move from one farm to another. The industry as a whole would gain by the readjustment of farm boundaries, and the single authority would be in a very favourable position to inaugurate and support schemes of co-operative enterprise amongst their tenants.

(4) A single authority would lead to great economy of management. Much of what is now called "land agent's work" is carried out expensively and inefficiently by private firms, college bursars, solicitors, and others, who often live some way from the estate. Ultimately the industry has to bear the cost of management, as well as the heavy legal expenses whenever the smallest piece of land is transferred. A comparatively small increase in the staff of the County Agricultural Officer would enable him to extend his activities to the whole of the agricultural land. In most cases the existing leases would be continued, and the amount of administrative work would be small.

(5) Similar economy would be effected in the matter of repairs. On large estates there are usually estate carpenters, on the smaller ones the repairs are "jobbed" out to local firms. On an estate which included all the agricultural land in a county a few specialist employees would do the necessary maintenance work much better and cheaper than under the present haphazard system.

(6) Land, once under the administration of the County Council, is saved for ever from the clutches of the land speculator. This would prevent the worst kind of speculative building, and the holding up of land with a potential building site value. It would also make it easier to choose and obtain the best site for schools, playing fields, etc.

(7) In various subtle ways the change would improve the status of farming. Blackacre would be primarily a farm, and not merely an outlying portion of a "desirable residential and sporting estate." Giles, an excellent farmer, but intolerably cantankerous when the hunt rides over his winter corn, would not have the same difficulty in renewing his lease. The patriarchal system has had its day. It had some advantages, but led to many abuses. It must go.

The chief opposition to the transfer of agricultural land is due to the confusion, assiduously encouraged by Conservative politicians, between the nationalisation of land and of farming. There are many practical objections to any large scale incursion of the State into the farming industry, and no such development is intended. A more serious argument against the Labour Party's proposals is likely to be brought forward in counties where there are large estates under Council management. It will be suggested that transfer to the State is responsible for the high rents charged for small holdings. This charge must be met by describing the actual financial transactions involved when the estates were taken over. The land was bought at an inflated price, usually at somewhere between forty and fifty years' purchase. The State charges six per cent. on the capital cost, and tenants also pay an addition for amortisation, a ludicrously unfair charge, as the land does not fall in to them. These charges raise the rent of land, which was formerly paying £1 an acre, up to £2 10s. Od. or £3. This weakness would not apply to the Labour Party's proposals, but it must also be remembered that any scheme of breaking up a large farm into small ones, if the latter are to be provided with homesteads, must raise the rent as reckoned on an acreage basis.

2. The Farmer.

The Labour Party's proposals do not include State farming, though some farms might be run in various parts of the country as a standard of good farming. In actual practice the County authorities, especially in the arable areas, would probably find themselves left with a certain number of farms which they could not let on satisfactory terms, and which they would farm themselves. On the whole, however, English farming would remain in the hands of individuals, and the State would exercise such pressure as it thought advisable in the same way as any large landlord. The bad farmer would not have his lease renewed, and the threat of non-renewal would be much more effective than to-day. The good and enterprising farmer would be encouraged by getting the buildings he requires. It would be easier to draft in new tenants, and land could be given to them from farms where the tenants, though suitable otherwise, have not sufficient capital to stock the area they rent at present. The public does not realise the extent to which large farms are now held by men who are practically bankrupt. The writer is a member of a pensions committee which has within two months received three applications for old age pensions from men farming over three hundred acres. In each case the applicant was able to show that he had no assets except his diminishing stock, but only a steadily increasing overdraft. From a national point of view it is a calamity that men should in such cases retain control of large areas of land.

3. Marketing.

Ultimately the problem of re-organising our farming industry turns upon the farmer's budget. Buildings, drainage, conditions of tenure, credit facilities, intelligent management, all these are important factors, but the future depends upon whether a well-run mixed farm on average soil will show, over a series of years, a sufficient surplus to provide better wages for the men employed, and an income for the farmer which will attract enterprising and intelligent men into the business. Most of the items on the expenditure side of the farmer's budget are, to a large extent, outside his control. Feeding stuffs, artificial manures, wages, rent, rates, repairs, railway charges, and the purchase of implements make up the bulk of his outgoings, but the individual farmer has very little say in the price which he pays for these services or commodities, nor can he usually reduce them substantially by combined efforts. Groups of small holders may join together to buy manures or cake, but anyone farming on a large enough scale to order goods by the truck-load has little to gain in this way. On the other side of the balance sheet, not only the farmer's incomings, but also his farm capital—his live stock, his stacks, and his growing crops—are entirely dependent on the fluctuations of markets, which are influenced to an overwhelming extent by two factors over which the farmer has no control, the price of imported food and the seasonal demand of industrial and city people. Very slight movements are sufficient to absorb the year's rent, or to make the difference between profit and loss on a year's work. A movement of four shillings a quarter in the price of wheat will cover the whole rent of the land on which it was grown, but such a change may occur during an afternoon's market. During the last two or three years both sheep and pigs have been the subject of violent price fluctuations. On three eastern county farms, the costings on which were analysed by Messrs. Venn and Carslaw, the fall in the price of sheep between March, 1925, and March, 1926, was sufficient to cause a loss of 47 per cent. on a total capital of £5,000. Pigs have been an even wilder trade, and the gambling nature of the "porker" business makes it almost impossible for a farmer to appreciate minor economies in feeding and management, which make a difference of two or three per cent. in the cost of production. Low and irregular prices for agricultural produce are the crux of the whole problem.

Agricultural depression since the war has been world wide, except on virgin land, but there are special difficulties in England. For many years nearly every European country and most of the large exporting areas of virgin land have found in England the best market, not only for certain main crops, but even more for any surplus they may have after a good season. Other European

countries are either protectionist or their urban population is too small to induce exporting firms to arrange for the commercial channels through which they could market their goods. Thus Denmark is a free trade country, but Copenhagen does not tempt even a Dutch potato grower to get rid of his surplus there, though there might be occasionally a small demand at a price higher than in England. There are well over thirty million people in England who are entirely divorced from the countryside, and the business of feeding them has fallen into the hands of several highly capitalised concerns, whose mills, factories, and distributing organisations are arranged, except as regards the liquid milk trade, to deal almost exclusively with sea-borne food stuffs. These concerns either use their own retail shops, like the Union Cold Storage Company and the Co-operative Wholesale Society, or else they supply the vast army of small-scale retailers. It is necessary to emphasise this point before discussing co-operation, for co-operative selling by English farmers is too often brought forward as a panacea by people who are really generalising from some particular commodity. This question must be considered in some detail, for the proposals of the Labour Party are dependent on the reorganisation of the home market.

Our agricultural produce may be divided into six main groups, and such division is essential. The marketing problem in each is different, and a great deal of the nonsense talked upon political platforms by all parties is due to general statements which are applicable to one group only. The figures are based on statistics for 1925, when the total value of all produce sold off farms was reckoned at £225,000,000.

1. Milk and milk products make up just a quarter of the total, and dairy farming is now the most important branch of English agriculture. Five out of every six gallons is sold as "liquid milk," and as this is one of the few commodities produced on our farms which is not directly in competition with foreign imports, the farmers have been able to get better prices than for butter and cheese, which are subject to very severe competition. The distribution of milk in the smaller towns is usually done by farmers themselves, but the supplying of the London and the larger cities requires a considerable amount of capital, and in the South is dominated by one or two firms. Farmers' "pools" or co-operative ventures are hardly likely to have enough capital to fight the London combines, but they are making some headway in the North of England, where retailing is more chaotic. There are several farmers' co-operative creameries which deal with surplus milk, but they are handicapped by the very low price of butter compared with that of liquid milk, and

by their inability to offer any more than the retailing combines, which buy most of their milk direct from the farms. The future would seem to lie in the public control of the retail milk trade in the cities and industrial areas. No very great decrease in the cost of distribution is possible until the household consumption has risen to the level of that in the United States or Sweden. The peddling of small quantities of milk to every house must be expensive, but the elimination of competition would save some waste. The field for farmers' co-operation is very restricted, unless they can drive the dairyman out of business, a contingency which is highly improbable, and might not help the public.

2. The fattening of cattle and sheep for the butcher is the next largest branch of farming, amounting to 23 per cent. of the total. Nearly all fat stock is sold through local markets, and the bidders are butchers, or the salaried buyers for butchers' rings in the large cities. Apart from the retailers there are few speculative middlemen in this business, and the only method of eliminating the middlemen is for farmers to run co-operative butchers' shops. These sometimes do quite well in small country towns, but the system will not stand any extension to the cities and industrial areas. A farmers' butchery is always faced with a dilemma. If it sells foreign meat it is merely another competing shop in a trade where competition is very keen, and everyone's hand is against the newcomer. If, however, the co-operative venture sells only home-grown meat, there will be seasons when it cannot compete against the ordinary butcher's shop, nor can it rely upon any feeling of loyalty amongst its customers, for all except the very richest people are quite used to eating chilled and frozen meat. It is absurd to talk as if farmers, with their few thousands of capital, could fight powerful organisations like the Union Cold Storage.

3. The sale of pig-meat realises over £26,000,000 yearly, which is about 12 per cent. of the total. Most of this is bought by butchers as pork, and the same arguments apply to the "porker" trade as to fat stock generally. The bacon trade involves a fairly simple factory process, and is a suitable industry for a farmers' co-operative venture. Unfortunately there is intense foreign competition in the bacon trade, a competition which will become insupportable when the Argentine and North Africa are more developed. The farmer, therefore, prefers to sell his pigs for pork, just as he prefers to sell his milk "liquid" rather than as butter. There are a few middlemen in the pig trade, but the speculative profits are taken by the retailers themselves.

4. It is difficult to obtain reliable figures for the wheat sold for milling (as apart from poultry feed), and of barley sold for

malting (as apart from grist). The combined value of both would not exceed 8 per cent. of the total agricultural produce, a figure which is hardly appreciated by certain arable farming enthusiasts. To this same group we can fairly add sugar beet, bringing the total to about 10 per cent., because all three have to undergo an expensive process before they can be sold to the public as bread, beer, or sugar. In no case is it likely that farmers could undertake the process themselves. Milling is quite out of the question, for the industry is controlled by the mills at our large ports, and the smaller inland millers are rapidly being driven out of the business, yet apart from farmers undertaking the milling, malting, or sugar extracting processes themselves there is no room here for co-operative ventures. The farmer can always sell direct to the miller, maltster or sugar-beet factory. The first two groups undoubtedly make speculative profits, but these do not seem to be sufficient to make either industry very prosperous. If the inland millers get driven out of the business altogether, it may be necessary for farmers to collect their wheat to be ground at the port mills, but at present the idea of a wheat "pool" in England could only be advocated by people who do not understand the position.

5. Poultry and eggs are sold to the value of about £15,000,000 yearly, which is considerably more than the total sale of wheat. This is an industry in which grading and classification is essential, and because of this the speculative middleman flourishes exceedingly. There is an immense field for organised societies which will collect, grade, and guarantee eggs from its members, and will help them to dispose of their poultry. Whether it would be best for the producer to carry through the whole business, and retail to the consumer, is a more debatable point.

6. The same arguments apply to the fruit and vegetable industry, most of which is totally disorganised, and in the South of England is dominated by that ridiculous anachronism, Covent Garden. The wastage here is enormous, but while the poultry industry should be able to organise itself, and the fruit growers are already showing signs of doing so for themselves, some assistance is needed both from the Government and from municipalities to help them over the initial stages.

It is clear that no general policy is applicable to these different groups. In the case of milk, sugar beet, and pork, the question of direct foreign competition is negligible, nor is the speculative middleman an important factor. The retailing of milk in the larger towns will be brought under public control, but otherwise there will be no alteration in the conditions governing these three commodities, except that the markets through which the porker trade is carried on may also come under public control. The



reorganisation of the fruit, vegetables, poultry and egg marketing is already being taken in hand by the Ministry, and to some extent by the Farmers' Union, and this work must be pressed on. It would be made much easier if the State was sole landlord. The State might include potatoes, but probably no other form of fruit, vegetables, and poultry under the operations of the Import Boards to be described in the next paragraph. The commodities mentioned in the paragraph comprise nearly three-quarters of the total produce from our farms.

It is clear that little can be done to alter conditions in the production of meat and wheat without controlling imports. At present four-fifths of the wheat consumed in England, and two-thirds of the meat, is imported, and the home prices are controlled by these imports. The foreign meat trade is already the monopoly of a trust, and the Labour Party proposes to take over this business of importing meat and wheat, which would be entrusted to Import Boards. The advantages of these schemes are that it would enable the Government to make bulk purchases from the exporters' "pools," which are already in existence in Canada and elsewhere, and eliminate the number of extremely prosperous speculators who take their toll *after* the pool has sold the wheat or meat. It would be possible to assist the Dominions, and to place wheat or meat on the market at prices which could be arranged for many months ahead. By steadyng the prices of these commodities the English farmer would be able to get somewhat better prices from the butcher and poultry feed dealer, and he would be able to conduct his work on a more businesslike footing. The milling industry would also be taken under public control, and would probably arrange to mill a certain proportion of English wheat. Local authorities would deal with the mills direct, organise the baking of bread, and fix its price.

It is difficult to foretell the exact lengths to which the work of the Import Boards would be carried, or how far the State will be ultimately drawn into the control of the internal markets. For the same reason no mention has been made of the important functions which the consumers' co-operative movement would take in the reorganisation of our whole system of marketing food. It is important to emphasise the point that there is no great future for retailing by farmers' co-operative societies. The effect of the Labour Party's proposals will be to put groups of English farmers in a position to deal on equal terms with the existing retailers, and with the factory owners who purchase their goods, and in the case of wheat to take the whole business of milling and baking under State control.

LABOUR'S AGRICULTURAL POLICY.

The foundations of the Labour Party's policy, which are to be found fully stated in *Labour's Policy on Agriculture*, are the emancipation of agricultural land from the hampering restrictions of private ownership, the establishment of equitable and humane conditions of life and employment for all rural workers, and the creation of the largest possible measure of security against the catastrophic changes in market conditions which are the curse of the industry to-day. With a view to encouraging good husbandry, to establishing security of tenure at fair rents for efficient farmers, and to finding the capital for development which landlords to-day are unable to provide, the State should acquire the ownership of the land on equitable terms. At the same time, with the advice and assistance of bodies representing the experience of practical agriculturists—the representative character and influence of which it should seek to strengthen—it must set itself to improve the financial and commercial organisation of the industry, with the defects of which farmers, however capable, cannot cope unaided. It must ensure, as has long been done in France and Germany, that both short and long term credit and facilities for insurance are easily available, must encourage the development of machinery for grading and collective marketing, both wholesale and retail, must secure that the farmer has at his disposal as efficient a service of transport and electrical power as are available for the manufacturer, and must introduce stability into the prices of meat and grain by the collective purchase of imported food stuffs. (From *Labour and the Nation*. Revised edition. Published by the Labour Party, 1929, price threepence.)

SELECTION OF FABIAN PUBLICATIONS.

(Complete list sent on application.)

THE COMMONSENSE OF MUNICIPAL TRADING. By BERNARD SHAW. 1/6 net; postage 2d.

THE DECAY OF CAPITALIST CIVILISATION. By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. Cloth, 4/6; paper, 2/6; postage 4d.

HISTORY OF THE FABIAN SOCIETY. By EDWARD R. PEASE. New edition. 1925. 6/-, postage 5d.

FABIAN ESSAYS. (1920 Edition). 2/6; postage, 3d.

KARL MARX. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 1/-; post free, 1/1d.

WHAT TO READ on Social and Economic Subjects. 2s. n. postage 1½d.

MORE BOOKS TO READ. (1920-1926). 6d.

TOWARDS SOCIAL DEMOCRACY? By SIDNEY WEBB. 1s. n. post. 1d
THIS MISERY OF BOOTS. By H. G. WELLS. 6d., post free 7d.

FABIAN TRACTS and LEAFLETS.

Tracts, each 16 to 52 pp., price 1d., or 9d. per dozen, unless otherwise stated.

Leaflets, 4 pp. each, price 1d. for three copies. 2s. per 100, or 20/- per 1000.

The Set, 10/-; post free 10/- Bound in buckram, 15/-; post free 15/-.

I General Socialism in its various aspects.

TRACTS.—212. Socialism and the Standardised Life. By WM. A. ROBSON. 2d.
216. Socialism and Freedom. By H. J. LASKI. 2d. 200. The State in the New Social Order. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 2d. 192. Guild Socialism. By G. D. H. COLE, M.A. 180. The Philosophy of Socialism. By A. CLUTTON BROCK. 159. The Necessary Basis of Society. By SIDNEY WEBB. 147. Capital and Compensation. By E. R. PEASE. 146. Socialism and Superior Brains. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 142. Rent and Value. 107. Socialism for Millionaires. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 133. Socialism and Christianity. By Rev. PERCY DEARMER. 2d. 78. Socialism and the Teaching of Christ. By Dr. J. CLIFFORD. 72. The Moral Aspects of Socialism. By SIDNEY BALL. 51. Socialism: True and False. By S. WEBB 2d. 45. The Impossibilities of Anarchism. By G. B. SHAW. 2d. 7. Capital and Land. 5. Facts for Socialists. Thirteenth Edition, 1926. 6d. 41. The Fabian Society: its Early History. By BERNARD SHAW.

II — Applications of Socialism to Particular Problems.

TRACTS.—226. The League of Nations. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 224. Public Ownership: Points from Prospectives. By A. EMIL DAVIES. 2d.
223. The British Cabinet: A Study of its Personnel, 1901-1924. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 3d. 220. Seditious Offences. By E. J. C. NEEP. 3d.
214. The District Auditor. By W. A. ROBSON. 1d. 197. International Labour Organisation of the League of Nations. By WM. S. SANDERS. 196. The Root of labour Unrest. By SIDNEY WEBB. 2d. 194. Taxes, Rates and Local Income Tax. By ROBERT JONES, D.Sc. 2d. 187. The Teacher in Politics. By SIDNEY WEBB. 2d. 183. The Reform of the House of Lords. By SIDNEY WEBB. 170. Profit-Sharing and Co-Partnership: a Fraud and Failure?

III.—Local Government Powers: How to use them.

TRACTS.—225. Education Committees: Their Powers and Duties. By H. SAMUELS. 3d. 218. The County Council: What it Is and What it Does. By H. SAMUELS. 190. Metropolitan Borough Councils. By C. R. ATTLEE, M.A. 2d. 191. Borough Councils. By C. R. ATTLEE, M.A. 2d. 189. Urban District Councils. By C. M. LLOYD, M.A. 2d. 62. Parish & District Councils. 2d. 148. What a Health Committee can do. 2d. 137. Parish Councils & Village Life. 2d

IV.—On the Co-operative Movement.

202. The Constitutional Problems of a Co-operative Society. By SIDNEY WEBB, M.P. 2d. 203. The Need for Federal Re-organisation of the Co-operative Movement. By SIDNEY WEBB, M.P. 2d. 204. The Position of Employees in the Co-operative Movement. By LILIAN HARRIS. 2d. 205. Co-operative Education. By LILIAN A. DAWSON. 2d. 206. The Co-operator in Politics. By ALFRED BARNES, M.P. 2d.

V.—Biographical Series. In portrait covers, 3d.

221. Jeremy Bentham. By VICTOR COHEN. 217. Thomas Paine. By KINGSLEY MARTIN. 215. William Cobbett. By G. D. H. COLE. 199. William Levett. 1800-877. By BARBARA HAMMOND. Robert Owen, Idealist. By C. E. M. JOAD. 179. John Ruskin and Social Ethics. By Prof. EDITOR MORLEY. 165. Francis Place. By ST. JOHN G. ERVINE. 166. Robert Owen, Social Reformer. By Miss Hutching. 167. William Morris and the Communist Ideal. By Mrs. TOWNSEND. 168. John Stuart Mill. By JULIUS WEST. 174. Charles Kingsley and Christian Socialism. By G. E. WILLIAMS.